

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/160,728	09	/25/1998	JERZY LEWAK	NISUS-002-PAP	6662	
7590 07/29/2004		07/29/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
William C. Boling				SEALEY, I	SEALEY, LANCE W	
Jaquez & Associates 750B Street, Suite 2640		·	\	ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
San Diego, CA 92101				2671		
				DATE MAILED: 07/29/200-	DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/160,728	LEWAK, JERZY	_
Advisory Notion	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lance W. Sealey	2671	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely	ition. A proper reply places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply of the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The approriginally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	ee NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mater	ially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	S .
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: 63-80.			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>61 and 62</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disappr	oved by the Examir	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	× .	
10. Other:	- T	Le zn	
	CODY		A.I
Best Available	SUPE	MARK ZIMMERMA RVISORY PATENT EX	N (AMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claim 61's 102(b) rejection is as follows:Gasper, in disclosing speech synchronized automation, also discloses, with respect to claim 61, a method of presenting, on a computer controlled display device (Abstract, fourth and fifth sentences), transformation rules (see col.14, II.27-67 and col.18, I.62-col.19, I.32--rules are "presented" is col.19, II.8-10, "The rules 901 are kept in character strings in a form easy for programmers to READ") of abstract representations of graphical abstract symbols (two examples: the tiles of letters in the Abstract, fourth sentence, and the dot and underline associated with KNIGHT AX in 912, FIG.9) using animations (two examples: the movement of tiles by the user on the screen as disclosed in the fourth through sixth sentences of the Abstract; and the movement of the dot and underline as the letter or combination of letters being pronounced changes; see col.19, II.1-5) to simulate continuous transformations (the continuous formation of tiles to produce letter sounds and, subsequently, word sounds; Abstract, sixth through eighth sentences).

Given this rejection, the examiner will now address the applicant's latest arguments:

The claim phrases are so broad that they do not distinguish over elements as taught by Gasper. For example, the applicant first contends that the claim 61 requires that "animations of graphical abstract symbols" be used for "presenting...transformation rules of abstract representations." It is true that Gaspar discloses animation of a talking head, but for the purpose of this claim, the objects being animated are the dot and underline associated wih "KNIGHT AX" in FIG.9. The purpose of the dot and the underline is to teach and illustrate pronounciation of words or other combinations of letters--see col.19, II.1-5. Also, the examiner disagrees with the applicant's assertion that the talking head is not a graphical abstract symbol; the talking head is an "graphical abstract representation" precisely because it does not look like a real head. The talking head is an abstract representation of a real head.

Moving to the next applicant assertion, animation of the dot and underline constitute "animation for presenting transformation rules" and "animation to simulate continuous transformations" because they move as syllables are sounded out, presenting the rule for sounding out syllables as they are continuously transformed into words; see col.19, II.1-5.

Since the elements being animated for the purpose of claim 61 can be either the dot and underline, the talking head, or the letters, claims 61 and 62 still stand rejected.

Best Available Copy